


SCORESHEET

stage: 2 reporter: UK opponent: USA room: D problem no.: 5

fight (round no.): 2 reviewer: GEORGIA juror's name: M. HART

signature: 

REPORTER 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORT

NOTES:

0	almost no explanation	theory/model	almost no	theory and experiment	relevant	comparison between	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	task fulfillment
1	some	fair	some	some	not well fitting	review of sources cited	partly	partly	own contribution
2	good	well performed	good	fair	deviations	some own input	average	interesting	own contribution
3	detailed	sufficient number	quite detailed	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points cleared	scientific contribution
4	demonstrative	correct	explained	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	some aspects	interesting points discussed	scientific arguments/responses
5	deep and comprehensible	detailed, complex	reproducible	+ reproducible	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental	above average	convincingly supported	relevant
6	shows physical insight	completely testable	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	greater extent	proved deep understanding	efficiency

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or questions asked

1 --- avoided some questions

2 --- cooperated well

3 --- answered directly to most questions

4 --- efficient, productive

5 --- deep misconceptions

6 --- deeply incorrect or show

OPONENT 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

0	almost no, irrelevant	time used	almost no	presentation	understanding of	relevant topics	correct own	priority
1	some unclear, aimed at resolving	very little	some main points	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	few	almost no	no
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	some important topics	to important topics	some	partial	average
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	+ improvement	good	many	many correct
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	new crucial points	almost all	+ improvement

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or questions asked

1 --- some incorrect, no questions asked

2 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

3 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	almost no	discussion	analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
1	clear things out	poor	almost no	almost no	poor	too few	irrelevant	no
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	too short/long	some	too short/long	too short/long	partially relevant	almost no
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	good	relevant parts	many	many	many	mostly adequate	some
4	time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement	fully	good

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 --- concise and correct or questions asked

1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

Juror's name: *Kasra Farain*
 signature: *Kasra Farain*

room: *D*
 problem no.: *5*

reviewer: *Georgia*

fight (round no.): *2*
 opponent: *USA*

stage: *2*
 reporter: *UK*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 6 + 8.5 - 0 = 40$

SCORESHEET

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			
0	phenomenon explanation	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some	some	some	some	some	some	some	some	some
2	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair
3	good	good	good	good	good	good	good	good	good
4	detailed	quite detailed, + results explained	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental + theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	above average	some aspects	some aspects
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, + reproducible, convincing analysis	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent	greater extent	greater extent
6	shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, completely testable	comprehensive, complex, + reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent	greater extent	greater extent

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points	some unclear points
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	some correct	some correct	some correct	some correct	some correct	some correct	some correct	some correct
3	almost all	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient
4	all & efficiently	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT				REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions
1	clear things out	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	partial	partial	partial	partial	partial	partial	partial
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	good	good	good	good	good	good	good	good

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 6$

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 reporter: UK opponent: USA reviewer: GEORGIA Juror's name: Dingli HE signature: Dingli HE

fight (round no.): 2 room: D problem no.: 5

REPORTER 1 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORT

NOTES:

phenomenon	explanation	almost no	almost no	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42
35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44
37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46
39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52
45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53
46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54
47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57
50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58
51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61
54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62
55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63
56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65
58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66
59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68
61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71
64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72
65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74
67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75
68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76
69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77
70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78
71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81
74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82
75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83
76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84
77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86
79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87
80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88
81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89
82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91
84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92
85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93
86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94
87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95
88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96
89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98
91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99
92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101
94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102
95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103
96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104
97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105
98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106
99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107
100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108
101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109
102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110
103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111
104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112
105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113
106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114
107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115
108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116
109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117
110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118
111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119
112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120
113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121
114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122
115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123
116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124
117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125
118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126
119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127
120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128
121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129
122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130
123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131
124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132
125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133
126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134
127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135
128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136
129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137
130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138
131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139
132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140
133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141
134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142
135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143
136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144
137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145
138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146
139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147
140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148
141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149
142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150
143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151
144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152
145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153
146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154
147	148	149	150					

SCORESHEET

stage: LT53
 reporter: Lihoo Jiro
 opponent: Emily Solomon
 fight (round no.): USA
 room: D
 reviewer: Sergio Palalakov
 problem no.: 5 stars
 Juror's name: Khan Lin
 signature:

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT				REPORT							
0	concede and correct or no questions asked	0	almost no, chaotic	0	almost no	0	misunderstood	0	theory/model	0	phenomenon	0	explanation
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	avoided some questions	1	only technical points cleared	1	partly	1	some	1	fair	1	some
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	cooperated well	2	points cleared	2	average	2	fair	2	good	2	some
3		3		3	some scientific points cleared	3	interesting	3	well performed, sufficient number	3	good	3	some
4		4		4	interesting points	4	some interesting results	4	not well fitting deviations	4	quite detailed, + results explained	4	detailed
5		5		5	discussed	5	some aspects	5	explained, conclusive	5	detailed, correct	5	demonstrative
6		6		6	brought in new physics	6	greater extent	6	well fitting, deviations	6	convincing analysis, + reproducible,	6	deep and comprehensible,
					understanding		and theoretical		convincing analysis,		shows physical insight		shows physical insight

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				OPPOSITION (SPEECH)							
0	concede and correct or no questions asked	0	almost no	0	almost no	0	no	0	correct own	0	time used	0	almost no, irrelevant
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	to some extent	1	very little	1	some	1	relevant topics	1	presentation	1	some unclear points
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	leading or cooperative	2	some	2	little	2	correct own	2	almost nothing	2	some relevant, aimed at resolving
3		3	quite efficient	3	many correct	3	partial	3	to most topics	3	some main points	3	short allowing short answers,
4		4	very efficient	4	many correct	4	good	4	to important topics	4	very little	4	prioritized, all time used
					+ improvement		new crucial		practically all		almost all		all & all
					suggestions		point(s)		practically all points		all relevant points		efficiently

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 - 0.5 = 5$

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5$
round down

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers,
 prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 6$

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				REVIEW OF REPORT							
0	concede and correct or no questions asked	0	speech summary	0	discussion analysis	0	almost no	0	poor	0	poor	0	report summary & understanding
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	poor	1	almost no	1	too short/long	1	poor	1	partial	1	most time used, many unclear points
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	informative, apt	2	relevant parts	2	too short/long	2	good	2	good	2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
3		3	brief but accurate	3	accurate, conclusive, + improvement	3	informative, apt	3	detailed, complex	3	resolved, apt and clear, well prioritized	3	time managed efficiently
							conclude, accurate, + improvement		fully				
							adequate		adequate				

NOTES: good questions, but didn't show why in presentation

Why was reporter giving contradictory answers?
 get summary with not

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 25 = 0 - 25 + 6

stage: 1
reporter: *LEONIA*
opponent: *NK*
fight (round no.): 2
room: ①
problem no.: *12*
reviewer: *USA*
signature: *Hokobari*
Juror's name: *McKICK*

REPORT

0	explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
2	some	some	fair	fair	review of sources, cited	partly
3	fair	good	well performed, sufficient number	not well fitting	some own labor	average
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
6	shows physical insight	completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some unclear points, aimed at resolving short answers, prioritized, all time used

2

3

4

5

6

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

0	almost no, chaotic	too few	relevant arguments/responses	contribution	almost no	only technical
1	avoided some questions	some	some	scientific contribution	almost no	points cleared
2	cooperated well	many	many	points cleared	some scientific	points cleared
3	answered directly	+ data/theory	convincingly supported	interesting points	discussed	interesting points
4	efficient, productive	proved deep understanding	productive	brought in new physics	discussed	discussed

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 15 = 0 - 25 + 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 some relevant, aimed at resolving

2

3

4

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

0	almost no	almost nothing	presentation	understanding of relevant topics	correct own	priority
1	very little	some main points	some main points	few	almost no	no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	partial	average
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	many	many
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	new crucial points	very good

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2

3

4

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

0	almost no	very little	own opinions presented	relevance of topics	contribution	priority
1	little	some	some	irrelevant	little	almost no
2	average	some correct	reading or cooperative	some correct	partial	average
3	many correct	quite efficient	many correct	many correct	many	many
4	very efficient	very efficient	very efficient	+ improvement	almost all	very good

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 2 = 0 - 25 + 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant

1

2

3

clear things out

some relevant, sufficient number, could

most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.

+short, apt and clear, well prioritized

time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

0	poor	almost no	discussion analysis	report summary & understanding	priority
1	partial	too short/long	almost no	poor	no
2	good	relevant parts	relevant parts	many	many
3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement	fully	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	partially relevant	almost no
3	brief but accurate	conclusive, accurate, suggestions	+ improvement	fully	good

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2

3

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

stage: 1
reporter: Georgia
opponent: UK
fight (round no.): 2
room: D
reviewer: USA
problem no.: 12

Juror's name: Kabira Farhan
signature: Kabira Farhan

NOTES:

6	shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	productive
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average	3	discussed	convincingly supported	answered directly
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects	2	interesting points	+ data/theory	cooperated well
3	good	good	well performed,	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	1	points cleared	many	questions
2	fair	fair	not well fitting	deviations	some own input	average	0	only technical	some	avoided some
1	some	some	some	not well fitting	review of sources, cited	partly	0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
0	explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	0	scientific contribution	arguments/responses	efficiency

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - some incorrect,
2 - inclusive or too long
3 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

0 - almost no scientific contribution
1 - some scientific points cleared
2 - interesting points
3 - discussed
4 - brought in new physics

0 - almost no relevant arguments/responses
1 - some
2 - many
3 - data/theory
4 - proved deep understanding

0 - almost no, chaotic
1 - avoided some questions
2 - cooperated well

0 - efficiency

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 - almost no, irrelevant
- 1 - some unclear points
- 2 - some relevant, aimed at resolving short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
- 3 - all &
- 4 - efficiently

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

0 - almost no time used
1 - very little
2 - not all
3 - almost all

0 - almost no understanding of presentation
1 - some main points
2 - main points
3 - all relevant points

0 - almost no relevant topics
1 - few
2 - some
3 - to most topics

0 - almost no correct own opinions expressed
1 - some
2 - to important topics
3 - to most topics

0 - almost no relevant topics
1 - some
2 - to most topics
3 - to most topics

0 - almost no practical all
1 - some
2 - many
3 - practically all

0 - almost no + improvement suggestions
1 - some
2 - many
3 - to most topics
4 - new crucial points(s)

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

0 - almost no scientific relevance
1 - little
2 - average
3 - good
4 - new crucial points(s)

0 - almost no relevance own opinions presented
1 - some
2 - average
3 - many
4 - almost all

0 - almost no contribution of topics
1 - very little
2 - some correct
3 - many correct
4 - + improvement suggestions

0 - almost no efficiency
1 - to some extent
2 - leading or cooperative
3 - quite efficient
4 - very efficient

0 - almost no prioritisation
1 - some
2 - to some extent
3 - reasonable
4 - very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - some incorrect,
2 - inclusive or too long
3 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 2 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 - clear things out
- 2 - most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
- 3 - +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

0 - almost no report summary & understanding
1 - poor
2 - partial
3 - good

0 - almost no discussion analysis
1 - too few
2 - some
3 - + improvement suggestions

0 - almost no pros & cons
1 - irrelevant
2 - mostly adequate
3 - fully

0 - almost no prioritisation
1 - no
2 - some
3 - good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0 - almost no speech summary
1 - poor
2 - too short/long
3 - brief but accurate

0 - almost no discussion analysis
1 - too few
2 - some
3 - + improvement suggestions

0 - almost no own opinions
1 - irrelevant
2 - mostly adequate
3 - fully

0 - almost no pros & cons
1 - irrelevant
2 - mostly adequate
3 - fully

0 - almost no prioritisation
1 - no
2 - some
3 - good

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - some incorrect,
2 - inclusive or too long
3 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: GEDK G1A opponent: UK room: D problem no.: 12 juror's name: Dingli HE signature: Dingli

fight (round no.): 2 reviewer: USA

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				ANSWERS TO JURY	
0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	task fulfillment	own contribution	relevant arguments/responses
1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	misunderstood	almost no	almost no, chaotic
2	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical	avoided some questions
3	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	some interesting results	interesting	some scientific points cleared	cooperated well
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	points cleared	points cleared	no questions asked
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, conclusive	discussed	discussed	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	no	no
1	almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	almost no
2	some unclear points	some main points	few	some	to some extent
3	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	all relevant points	many	to most topics	quite efficient
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very efficient

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		ANSWERS TO JURY	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	clear things out	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	no questions asked
2	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	too short/long	partially relevant	almost no	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

NOTES:

NOTES:

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: LT 53
 reporter: Georgia
 opponent: Phillip Cloud
 fight (round no.): 1
 room: D USA
 reviewer: Seofin Jung
 problem no.: 12 byro
 Juror's name: Khon Lim
 signature:

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.0 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$

REPORT

NOTES:

6	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex	completely testable	shows physical insight
5	demonstrative	quite detailed	errors analysed	quite detailed
4	detailed	+ results explained	+ reproducible	detailed
3	good	well performed	convincing analysis	good
2	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	fair
1	almost no	almost no	fair	some
0	explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	greater extent than expected	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincing analysis	deep and comprehensive
3	above average	considerable experimental or theoretical	explained, conclusive	demonstrative
2	some aspects	considerable experimental	+ theory limits	detailed
1	interesting results	some interesting results	qualitatively analysed	quite detailed
0	misunderstood	review of sources, cited	not well fitting	well performed, sufficient number

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial points	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
3	good	many	all relevant points	almost all
2	partial	some	to important topics	not all
1	little	few	some main points	very little
0	almost no contribution of topics presented	almost no options expressed	almost no presentation	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

4	productive	convinced	convinced	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	proved deep understanding	convincingly supported	convincingly supported	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	relevant arguments/responses	+ data/theory	answered directly	incomplete or too long
1	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	some incorrect
0	almost no scientific contribution	only technical	avoided some questions	no questions asked
0	almost no scientific contribution	too few	almost no, chaotic	concise and correct or no questions asked

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

too wordy; not getting to the point or answering directly

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 - 2 = 6$

NOTES:

4	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own	practically all points	efficiently
3	almost all	presentation	correct own	all relevant points	almost all
2	not all	almost nothing	relevant topics	main points	not all
1	very little	no or irrelevant	options expressed	some main points	very little
0	almost no	almost no	practically all	some	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial points	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
3	good	many	all relevant points	almost all
2	partial	some	to important topics	not all
1	little	few	some main points	very little
0	almost no contribution of topics presented	almost no options expressed	almost no presentation	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

4	productive	convinced	convinced	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	proved deep understanding	convincingly supported	convincingly supported	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	relevant arguments/responses	+ data/theory	answered directly	incomplete or too long
1	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	some incorrect
0	almost no scientific contribution	only technical	avoided some questions	no questions asked
0	almost no scientific contribution	too few	almost no, chaotic	concise and correct or no questions asked

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2 - 2 = 7$ round up.

NOTES:

3	time managed efficiently	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	most time used, many unclear points	clear things out
2	some relevant, sufficient number, could	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	some relevant, sufficient number, could
1	too few, mostly irrelevant	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	too few, mostly irrelevant
0	almost no	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	almost no

REVIEW OF REPORT

3	report summary & understanding analysis	discuss own opinions	pros & cons	practically all points	efficiently
2	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	pros & cons	all relevant points	almost all
1	almost no	some	some	main points	not all
0	almost no	too few	too few	some main points	very little

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

3	speech summary	discuss own opinions	pros & cons	practically all points	efficiently
2	speech summary	discuss own opinions	pros & cons	all relevant points	almost all
1	almost no	some	some	main points	not all
0	almost no	too few	too few	some main points	very little

ANSWERS TO JURY

3	concise and correct or no questions asked	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	concise and correct or no questions asked	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	concise and correct or no questions asked	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
0	concise and correct or no questions asked	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: Georgia

fight (round no.): 2 opponent: United Kingdom

room: D reviewer: USA

problem no.: 12

juror's name: Young-Gui Tsou signature: *John*

REPORTER 1 + 3 = 2 - 0 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORT

NOTES:

6	shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
5	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex, correct	+ reproducible, errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	above average
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
3	demonstrative	correct	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
2	good	good	well performed, deviations	not well fitting	some own input	interesting points cleared
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	only technical
0	almost no explanation	almost no theory/model	too few relevant experiments	no/almost no comparison between theory and experiment	others' data, incorrectly cited	almost no scientific contribution

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	brought in new physics	discussed interesting points	+ data/theory	convincingly supported	proved deep understanding	productive
3	discussed interesting points	points cleared	some scientific points cleared	points cleared	convincingly supported	efficient, answered directly
2	points cleared	points cleared	some scientific points cleared	points cleared	convincingly supported	to most questions
1	only technical	only technical	some	some	convincingly supported	answered directly
0	almost no scientific contribution	almost no arguments/responses	too few relevant arguments/responses	too few relevant arguments/responses	convincingly supported	to most questions

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

OPPONENT 1 + 1 + 3 = 2 - 0 = 4

Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

4	time used	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
2	not all	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
1	very little	some main points	some main points	few	some	almost no
0	almost no	almost nothing	presentation	addressed	relevant topics	correct own

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all suggestions	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no scientific contribution of topics	irrelevant	very little own options	almost no efficiency

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

REVIEWER 1 + 2 + 2 = 2 - 0 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

3	time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	conclusive	+ improvement	good
2	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	2 --- good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate
1	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 --- partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant
0	clear things out	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant

REVIEW OF REPORT

3	report summary & understanding	3 --- detailed, complex	conclusive	+ improvement	good
2	some relevant, sufficient number, could	2 --- good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate
1	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 --- partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant
0	clear things out	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

3	speech summary	3 --- brief but accurate	conclusive, accurate, + improvement	adequate
2	informative, apt	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	many
1	too short/long	1 --- too short/long	some	partially relevant
0	poor	0 --- poor	almost no	too few

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 reporter: USA
 fight (round no.): 2 opponent: Georgia
 room: D reviewer: Ustad Kagon
 problem no.: 16
 Juror's name: Young-Gin Yoon
 signature: yoon

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORTER

6	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	completely testable	detailed, complex,	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	productive
5	demonstrative	detailed	correct	quite detailed,	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	above average	3	discussed interesting points	convincingly supported + data/theory	answered directly
4	detailed	good	well performed,	fair	sufficient number of deviations	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	some aspects	2	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	fair	fair	not well fitting	fair	deviations	some own input	review of sources, cited	average	1	scientific points cleared	some	avoided some questions
2	some	some	some	some	no or irrelevant	almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	partly	0	almost no contribution	too few arguments/responses	almost no, chaotic
1	almost no	almost no	almost nothing	presentation	relevant topics	correct own	priority	no	0	irrelevant contribution of topics	efficiency	no
0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	understanding of relevant topics	correct own priority	scientific relevance	priority	no	0	irrelevant own options presented	efficiency	no

REPORT

NOTES:

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
- 3 almost all
- 4 all & efficiently

1 + 1 + 25 - 0 = 26
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPONENT

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
3	good	many	many correct	many	all relevant points	almost all
2	partial	average	some correct	some	main points	not all
1	little	some	to some extent	some	some main points	very little
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	almost nothing	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

NOTES:

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
- 3 almost all
- 4 all & efficiently

1 + 1 + 25 - 0 = 26
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPONENT

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
3	good	many	many correct	many	all relevant points	almost all
2	partial	average	some correct	some	main points	not all
1	little	some	to some extent	some	some main points	very little
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	almost nothing	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized
- 4 time managed efficiently

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

REVIEWER

3	detailed,	conclusive,	+ improvement	fully	good
2	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	adequate
1	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	adequate
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	good

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized
- 4 time managed efficiently

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

REVIEWER

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, some inclusive or too long

2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

QUESTIONS

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

REVIEW OF REPORT

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 some incorrect, some inclusive or too long
- 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

QUESTIONS

SCORESHEET

stage: LT 53
 reporter: USA Ann Cassidy
 opponent: George Zur Bach
 fight (round no.):
 room: D
 reviewer: Ben Miller
 problem no.: 16
 Juror's name: Khen Lin
 signature: *[Signature]*
 Metcove

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 = 0 - 2 = 5

REPORT

NOTES: need to investigate coupling of metamore + platform in report.

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	discussed	interesting points
5	demonstrative	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	discussed	discussed
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testable	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

contribution	scientific arguments/responses	relevant	efficiency
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical	some	avoided some questions
2	some scientific	many	cooperated well
3	interesting points	+ data/theory	answered directly
4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1 = 1 - 0.5 = 4

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution of topics	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	priority
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no
1	little	some	to some extent	almost no
2	partial	average	some correct	some
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ suggestions	very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving
 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3 all & efficiently
 4 practically all points

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 = 0 - 1 = 6

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
0	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	poor	too short/long	partially relevant	almost no
2	good	relevant parts	many	some
3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive, + improvements	fully	good

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. most time used, many unclear points
 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 reporter: USA opponent: GEORGIA reviewer: UK Juror's name: R. J. HE signature: R. J. HE

fight (round no.): 2 room: D problem no.: 16

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

REPORT

NOTES:

6	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
5	demonstrative	detailed, correct	+ results explained	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	above average
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
3	good	well performed, good	deviations	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
2	fair	fair	not well fitting	deviations	some own input	average
1	some	some	fair	some	review of sources, cited	partly
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

phenomenon theory/model experiments relevant comparison between own contribution task fulfillment

explanation theory/model experiments relevant comparison between own contribution task fulfillment

shows physical insight detailed, complex, convincing analysis well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive considerable experimental and theoretical greater extent than expected

deep and comprehensive detailed, complex, completely testable + reproducible, convincing analysis well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive considerable experimental and theoretical greater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive
3	discussed interesting points	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly
2	points cleared	many	cooperated well
1	some scientific	some	avoided some questions
0	almost no contribution	too few arguments/responses	almost no, chaotic

scientific contribution relevant arguments/responses efficiency

scientific contribution relevant arguments/responses efficiency

DISCUSSION WITH JUROR, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no

time used understanding of relevant topics correct own options expressed prioritisation

time used understanding of relevant topics correct own options expressed prioritisation

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all suggestions	very efficient
3	good	many	quite efficient
2	partial	average	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	almost no

scientific relevance own opinions efficiency

scientific relevance own opinions efficiency

DISCUSSION WITH JUROR and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

3	time managed efficiently	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	most time used, many unclear points	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	most time used, many unclear points	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	too few, mostly irrelevant	0
1	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	0	0
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	0	0	0	0

report summary & understanding discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

report summary & understanding discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

REVIEW OF REPORT

3	detailed, complex, accurate, + improvements	fully adequate	good
2	good	mostly adequate	some
1	partial	partially relevant	almost no
0	poor	irrelevant	no

speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

3	brief but accurate, + improvements	fully adequate	good
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	some
1	poor	partially relevant	almost no
0	summary	irrelevant	no

speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation

ANSWERS TO JUROR

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

conscience and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 reporter: USA
 fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Georgia
 reviewer: UK
 room: D
 problem no.: 16
 Juror's name: KASVA FAYAN
 signature: KASVA FAYAN

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 = 7 - 1 = 6

REPORT

0	phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	task fulfillment
1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	some	partly	
2	some	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	
4	detailed	quite detailed,	errors analysed	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects	
5	demonstrative	correct	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent	
6	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	than expected	

NOTES:

0	almost no, chaotic	avoided some questions	cooperated well	efficiency
1	too few	some	many	relevant arguments/responses
2	some	many	many	scientific contribution
3	only technical	points cleared	points cleared	interesting points
4	almost no	points cleared	points cleared	brought in new physics

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 = 2 + 1.5 = 3.5 - 0 = 3.5

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving
1	some unclear points	short allowing short answers,
2	short allowing short answers,	prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

0	almost no	almost no	almost no	correct own	relevant topics	understanding of	time used
1	some	some	some	no	no or irrelevant	presentation	almost no
2	some	some	some	few	some main points	some main points	very little
3	reasonable	to most topics	many	practically all points	all relevant points	efficiently	all &
4	reasonable	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	efficiently	all &

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

0	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

0	almost no	almost no	almost no	correct own	relevant topics	scientific contribution	relevance	own opinions	efficiency	priority
1	some	some	some	no	no or irrelevant	irrelevant	very little	almost no	almost no	almost no
2	some	some	some	few	some main points	some	to some extent	leading or cooperative	quite efficient	reasonable
3	reasonable	to most topics	many	practically all	all relevant points	quite efficient	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good
4	reasonable	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	very efficient	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 = 3 + 1.5 = 4.5 - 1 = 3.5

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could
1	clear things out	most time used, many unclear points
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0	no	no	no	discuss	analysis	report summary & understanding	poor	poor	irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some	some	some	no	no or irrelevant	almost no	some	some	some	some	some	some	some
2	some	some	some	few	some main points	some main points	to some extent	leading or cooperative	quite efficient	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable
3	good	good	good	practically all	all relevant points	efficiently	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good	very good	very good	very good
4	good	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	very efficient	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good	very good	very good	very good

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

0	no	no	no	discuss	analysis	report summary & understanding	poor	poor	irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some	some	some	no	no or irrelevant	almost no	some	some	some	some	some	some	some
2	some	some	some	few	some main points	some main points	to some extent	leading or cooperative	quite efficient	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable
3	good	good	good	practically all	all relevant points	efficiently	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good	very good	very good	very good
4	good	+ improvement	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	very efficient	many correct	many correct	very efficient	very good	very good	very good	very good

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Mihaly Horvath		6	7	8	6	6	6	6	4	7			
Kara Farain		4	7	6	10	8	6	6	6	6			
Gingli He		6	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	7			
Khan Lim		5	6	7	5	5	6	5	4	6			
Young-hui Yoon		6	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	7			
	Acting Team Member	Giong: Butbaia			Lihao Jiao			Anna Cassidy					
		Phillip Cloud			Emily Solomon			Zura Jashi					
		Jung Seojin			Sergo Poliakov			Benjamin Miller					
	Rejected Problems	10. pulling glasses apart						4. Magnetic hills					
	Accepted Problem	12. Torsion Gyroscope			S. Leidenfrost Stars			16. Metronome Synchronization					

Signature Fight Assistant: Double-checked with Scoring Guidelines by second Fight Assistant (signature):